



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,960	04/03/2001	Grenville J. Armitage	ARMITAGE 2	1881

7590 07/21/2006

HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/824,960
Filing Date: April 03, 2001
Appellant(s): ARMITAGE, GRENVILLE J.

John E. Curtin (Reg. 37,602)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/26/05.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Claimed Subject Matter*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal*

The appellant's statement of the grounds of correction in the brief is correct.

The Examiner has included below a copy of the rejections from the Final Office Action. These rejections are further clarified in view of Applicant's remarks in the Response to Arguments section.

(7) *Claims Appendix*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) *Evidence Relied Upon*

Art Unit: 2154

6189039	Harvey et al.	2-2001
6131120	Reid	10-2000

Perkins ed., RFC 2002, <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2002.txt?number=2002>, October 1996, pgs. 1-74.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 2 and 4-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins ed. (RFC 2002, <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2002.txt?number=2002>, October 1996) (hereinafter Perkins) in view of Harvey et al. (US 6,189,039 B1) (hereinafter Harvey).

3. As for claim 1, Perkins discloses a method of supporting a mobile host on an information network configured for multicast routing, comprising:

defining a subnet (U1) of the network that includes one or more mobile hosts and a first interface of a home router in the network, and identifying the first interface and the mobile hosts with corresponding unicast network addresses (U1.x) (Sections 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7; Both the long-term – or *home* – IP address and link-layer addresses are unicast addresses identified with the mobile nodes. Note that the home router also

has a corresponding IP address and link-layer address.);

assigning the first interface of the home router and the mobile hosts corresponding group addresses (Mx) according to a defined relation with respect to said unicast network addresses (Section 4.4, Multicast Datagram Routing);

linking the mobile hosts with the network at corresponding points of attachment (Section 1.7, Protocol Overview, note registration);

sending a request from a given mobile host to join a group corresponding to a group address assigned to the given mobile host each time the mobile host links with the network at a new point of attachment, thereby enabling routers in the network to track the mobile host as it moves its link with the network from one point of attachment to another, and to route unicast packets originating from a host outside the subnet and destined to a given mobile host, by way of a virtual link defined between the home router and the given mobile host (Section 1.7, Protocol Overview, note registration and tunneling; Section 4.4, Multicast Datagram Routing, note joining of group and tunneling).

Perkins does not specifically disclose mapping, at the second interface of the home router, unicast addresses of packets received at the second interface and destined to members of the subnet, to the group addresses assigned to the members of the subnet. Harvey teaches:

identifying a second interface of the home router with a corresponding unicast network address (U2.x) (IP unicast socket connection, step 112, Fig. 6; col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 4); and

mapping, at the second interface of the home router, unicast addresses of packets received at the second interface and destined to members of the subnet (U1), to the group addresses (Mx) assigned to the members of the subnet (col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 4; Fig. 6).

Harvey's teachings provide the advantage of allowing communication between unicast and multicast subnets and minimizing network traffic (col. 1, lines 27-40; col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Perkins by mapping, at the second interface of the home router, unicast addresses of packets received at the second interface and destined to members of the subnet, to the group addresses assigned to the members of the subnet in order to allow for communications between unicast and multicast subnets and minimize network traffic, as taught by Harvey above.

4. As for claim 2, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 1, including linking a given mobile host with the network by way of a wireless link with a base station that is connected to the network (Section 1.2, Goals).
5. As for claim 4, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 1, including assigning the mobile hosts unique local addresses (Lx) corresponding to the current points of attachment of the mobile hosts with the information network (link-layer address, Sections 1.6 and 1.7).
6. As for claim 5, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim, wherein a local address is assigned to a given mobile host by a network router associated the host's current point of attachment with the network (Section 1.7).

7. As for claim 6, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 4, including transmitting information packets from a first mobile host on the subnet (U1) to a second mobile host on the subnet, by encapsulating the packets with an outer encapsulating header whose destination address is the group address (Mx) assigned to the second mobile host (Section 4.4, Multicast Datagram Routing).
8. As for claim 7, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 6, including placing the local address (Lx) of the first mobile host as the source address in the encapsulating header (Section 1.7).
9. As for claim 8, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 7, including placing the unicast address (U1.x) of the second mobile host as the destination address in an inner encapsulated header of the packets, and placing the unicast address (U1.y) of the first mobile host as the source address in the encapsulated header (Sections 1.5 and 1.7).
10. As for claim 9, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 4, including transmitting information packets from a given mobile host on the subnet (U1) to a host outside the subnet, by encapsulating the packets with an encapsulating header whose destination address is a group address (Mx) assigned to the first interface of the home router (Section 1.7; Section 4.4).
11. As for claim 10, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 9, including placing the local address (Lx) of the given mobile host as the source address in the encapsulating header (Section 1.7).
12. As for claim 11, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 10, including placing

the unicast address (U2.x) of the host outside the subnet as the destination address in an inner encapsulated header of the packets, and placing the unicast address (U1.x) of the given mobile host as the source address in the encapsulated header (Sections 1.5 and 1.7).

13. As for claim 12, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 1, including transmitting multicast information packets from a given mobile host on the subnet to a group (G) of other hosts on the network, by encapsulating the packets with an outer encapsulating header whose destination address is the group address (M1) assigned to the first interface of the home router (Section 4.4, Multicast Datagram Routing).
14. As for claim 13, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 12, including placing the local address (Lx) of the given mobile host as the source address in the encapsulating header (Section 1.7).
15. As for claim 14, Perkins teaches a method similar to claim 13, including placing the group address (G) of the other hosts as the destination address in an inner encapsulated header of the packets, and placing the unicast address (U1.x) of the given mobile host as the source address in the encapsulated header (Sections 1.5 and 1.7).
16. **Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Harvey and in further view of Reid (US 6,131,120) (hereinafter Reid).
Although obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, neither Perkins nor Harvey specifically disclose linking a given mobile host with the network by using a modem

that is connected to a public switched telephone network having a server which is linked with the information network. Reid teaches linking a given mobile host with the network by using a modem that is connected to a public switched telephone network having a server which is linked with the information network (col. 1, lines 46-57; Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Perkins and Harvey by linking a given mobile host with the network by using a modem that is connected to a public switched telephone network having a server which is linked with the information network, in order to remotely access a network as taught by Reid above.

(10) Response to Arguments

A. Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 4-14 Under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

Appellant's Argument: Appellant asserts on page 27 of the Brief that the "multicast sockets" in Harvey are not assigned to a home router and to mobile hosts. Appellant further asserts on page 28 of the Brief that the combination of Perkins and Harvey is improper because Harvey is not related to the tracking of a mobile device.

Examiner's Response: As noted in the Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on Harvey only to teach the mapping between unicast and multicast (group) addresses. The Examiner finds that, contrary to Appellant's arguments, there is ample motivation in the references and in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art for making this combination.

As detailed in the Final Office Action, Perkins discloses a subnet with a home router and mobile hosts having both unicast and group addresses. Mobile hosts on

the subnet are able to move between points of attachment within the subnet by establishing virtual links. Although not relied upon in the rejection since the feature is taught explicitly by Harvey, the second interface (U2.x, Fig. 2) is also inherent to the home router of Perkins for receiving communications from outside of the subnet (see Section 4.5 of Perkins), as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, Perkins discloses the system of Appellant's Fig. 2 in its entirety. What Perkins fails to specifically disclose is the mapping of unicast addresses received at the second interface to the multicast addresses of the first interface. Harvey is relied upon to teach this limitation of the claims.

Appellant has failed to fully appreciate the significance of Harvey's teachings, interpreting them in too narrow of a light, where it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that they have broader implications. Harvey generally teaches transferring data between subnets (network segments) by mapping between unicast and group (multicast) addresses. Although Harvey fails to specify that the nodes in a subnet may be mobile hosts (the primary embodiment of Harvey discloses subnets arranged in a ring configuration), the teachings of Harvey have obvious applications in a network having mobile hosts. In other words, the teachings of Harvey have obvious applications for transferring data between *any* type of subnet. As explicitly recited in col. 3, lines 9-17, the invention of Harvey may be implemented in any computer network comprising one or more "network segments." Such network segments could obviously comprise subnets with mobile hosts, since such a subnet would meet the definition of "a given portion of a network over which

data in a particular format may be transported without modification.” Notably, *all* of the multiple benefits recited by Harvey in col. 1, line 62 – col. 3, line 14, would carry-over to a mobile subnet (i.e. none of them are specific to ring networks or fixed hosts).

Col. 2, lines 34-39, discloses a particularly relevant embodiment which is also shown in Fig. 6:

Alternatively, the receiver application, or a network administrator, launches the repeater utility, which then converts the IP unicast stream back to IP multicast format for re-roadcast over the network segment, so that other clients on the segment may receive it.

This embodiment teaches precisely the mapping of addresses recited by Appellant (see also col. 6, line 58 – col. 7, line 4). It further provides the obvious benefit of allowing a packet addressed to the subnet to be re-broadcast to the relevant group members. In this embodiment, the “receiver application” (i.e. the application which receives the packet) is responsible for performing the mapping of the addresses and re-broadcast of the message. Thus, “the receiver application” is inherently acting as a router for the subnet in this embodiment. Notably, the receiver application (or repeater) is software which may reside on a server or other hardware (see col. 3, lines 36-38). Thus, the Examiner is correct in the interpretation that the repeater is equivalent to the home router. At the very least, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the home router of Perkins by including a repeater for mapping the addresses in order to minimize network traffic, increase network efficiency, enhance bandwidth utilization, and

Art Unit: 2154

provide for selective streaming of video data, as taught by Harvey (col. 1, line 62 – col. 2, line 14).

For all of these reasons, claims 1, 2 and 4-14 are properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as anticipated by Perkins in view of Harvey.

B. Rejection of Claim 3 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)

Appellant's Argument: Appellant asserts that because claim 1 is allowable, dependent claim 3 is allowable for the same reasons.

Examiner's Response: Claim 3 is properly rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for the same reasons cited with respect to claim 1.

(11) *Related Proceeding(s) Appendix*

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Chang Jungwon

Jungwon Chang
July 13, 2006

Conferees

John Follansbee

[Signature]
JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

[Signature]
Supervisory Patent Examiner
TC 2100